



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/353,998	07/15/1999	SUSUMU SENSYU	SONY-P9817	4457
22850 7:	590 11/05/2003		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			SHAH, NILESH R	
1940 DUKE ST ALEXANDRIA			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2127	1/2
			DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003	17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			PRQ			
See Marie	Application No.	Applicant(s)	V			
Advisory Action	09/363,892	YODA, AKIRA				
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit				
<i>i</i>	Nilesh R Shah	2127				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 06 October 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this (1) a timely filed amendment	s application. A proper re ent which places the appli	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY (check either a) or t	p)]				
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b)	than SIX MONTHS from the mailing S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS late on which the petition under 37 Insion and the corresponding amoused statutory period for reply origina	ng date of the final rejection. OF THE FINAL REJECTION. CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate and of the fee. The appropriate exilly set in the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).		•				
2. \boxtimes The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:					
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);				
(b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or	simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claim	ms.			
NOTE: As per claims 8-18 new matter is added	therefor proposed amendm	ent will not be entered .				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request f application in condition for allowance because: S	or reconsideration has been seen to be seen	en considered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed So	OLELY to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims v			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 8-18						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other: See Continuation Sheet						
Other. See Continuation Sheet						



Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims raise new issues that would require further consideration and or search.

Continuation of 10. Other: In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation Applicant's arguments filed 10/06/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In addition claims 14-18 has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951)..

MAJID A BANANKHAM